



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/732,023

12/08/2000

Paula S. Newman

A0988

1621

47374

7590

10/04/2006

LAW OFFICES OF PARTICK J.S. INOUE
810 THIRD AVENUE
SUITE 258
SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2144

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,023

Applicant(s)

NEWMAN, PAULA S.

Examiner

Tammy T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Detailed Office Action

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 7, 2006 has been entered.
2. Claims 26-35 are newly added.
3. Claims 1-35 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7,-9, 12, 14-17, 20, 22-28, 30-33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hulikunta Prahlad Raghunandan. (USPN 6,832,244 – Date of Patent: December 14, 2004, herein referred to as “Raghunandan”).
6. As to claim 1, Raghunandan discloses the invention substantially as claimed, Raghunandan teaches including a method for displaying an e-mail collection, the e-mail collection including a plurality of e-mail messages assigned to one or more categories and subcategories, the method comprising: displaying each of the categorized messages in accordance with a user-defined display specification [see Raghunandan, col.6, line 5 to col.7, line 5], wherein the display specification specifies , for each category and subcategory [see col.6, lines 57-65], the manner in which the messages categorized within that particular category or subcategory [see col.7, lines 20-35] are to be displayed in a top-level representation of the entire e-mail collection [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 55-67, and fig.5](email classification generation system maintains a count of the messages in each level of hierarchy and display the counts to the user when required), and wherein at least one category or subcategory is displayed in a different manner than at least one other category or subcategory [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 20-47] (it is very easy to identify email content by looking at the symbol in graphic display in different event color).
7. As to claims 2, 9, and 17, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: receiving a plurality of display specifications from a user, storing the received display

specification receiving a user selection of one of the plurality of display specifications specification [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 9-12] (shows email in a order and priorities sequence based on content indicative of urgency and importance form the user perspective); and displaying the e-mail collection, in accordance with the user selected display specification [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 9-10].

8. As to claims 4, 11, and 19, Raghunandan teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the display specification provide that messages in at least on e of the plurality of categories and subcategories are encapsulated in the corresponding category, and that the top-level display of the entire e-mail collection includes one items from the corresponding category [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 9-12] (display can be also used to show the emails in a order and priorities sequence based on content indicative of urgency and importance from the user's respective), and that the top-level display of the entire e-mail collection includes one item from the corresponding [see Raghunandan, col.8, lines 5-11](messages in each level of the hierarchy and displays the counts to the user when required).
9. As to claims 5, 12, and 20, Raghunandan teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the display specification includes a plurality of user-defined rule-based categories, wherein cone of the plurality of user-defined rule-based categories is nested within another of the plurality of user-defined rule-based categories [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 9-12, and col.2, lines 46-49] (prioritizing the said graphical message displays in accordance with user-defined requirement), and wherein the nested user-defined rule-based category is displayed differently than the another of the

- plurality of user-defined rule-based categories [see Raghunandan, col.6, lines 54-65](emails are displayed on the display device by graphic output generator, which converts each email into a graphical symbol).
10. As to claim 7, Raghunandan, teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: providing at least one tool button on the top-level representative of the e-mail collection that is adapted to receive a user command to perform an operation on one or more messages associated with an identified item [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 15-47](colour of button); and performing the operation on the one or more messages associated with the identified item in response to a user operation of the tool button [see Raghunandan, fig.6A-6D, and col.8, lines 11-55]
11. As to claims 8, and 16, Raghunandan, teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer controlled display system for displaying an e-mail collection, the e-mail collection including a plurality of e-mail messages assigned to one or more categories and subcategories, the system comprising: a display for presenting the e-mail collection on a viewing area of the display [see Raghunandan, col.6, line 5 to col.7, line 5]; and a processor that is adapted to control the display to display the categorized messages in accordance with a user-defined display specification, wherein the display specification specifies, for each category and subcategory the manner in which the messages categorized within that particular category or subcategory [see col.6, lines 57-65], are to be displayed in a top-level representation of the entire e-mail collection [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 55-67, and fig.5](email classification generation system maintains a count of the messages in each level of

hierarchy and display the counts to the user when required), and wherein at least one category is displayed in a different manner than at least one other category or subcategory [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 20-47] (it is very easy to identify email content by looking at the symbol in graphic display in different event color).

12. As to claim 14, Raghunandan teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the processor is further adapted: to provide a tool button on the top-level representation of the e-mail collection that is adapted to receive a user command to delete messages associated with an identified item, and to delete the messages associated with the identified item in response to a user operation of the tool button [see Raghunandan, col.8, lines 11-65].
13. As to claims 15 and 22, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the processor is further adapted: to receive a user command from at least one a tool button on the top-level representation of the e-mail collection [see Reghunandan, col.7, lines 35-46]; and to perform the operation the on one or more messages associated with the identified item in response to a user operation of the tool button [see Raghunandan, col.7, line 59 to col.8, line26].
14. As to claim 23, 24, and 25, Raghunandan, teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the messages within the categories and subcategories may be displayed as at least two of: messages, threads, and groups [see Raghunandan, col.6, lines 55-67].
15. As to claim 26, Raghunandan, teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the display specification provides that each of the messages in at least one of the plurality of categories and subcategories provides that each of the messages in at least one of the

plurality of categories and subcategories are displayed separately in the top-level display of the entire e-mail collection [see Raghunandan, col.7, line 59 to col.8, line 11].

16. As to claim 27, Raghunandan, teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the display specification provides that at least one of the plurality of categories and subcategories, and each of the messages categorized therein, is to be omitted from the top-level display of the entire e-mail collection [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 5-58].
17. As to claims 28, and 33, Raghunandan, teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: supplying a tool button associated with an item requesting expansion of the item, and if the expansion is requested, differentially performing the expansion of the item [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 35-45].
18. As to claims 30, and 35, Raghunandan, teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising expanding an item representing an individual thread on the top-level representation of the e-mail collection by displaying the messages associated with the selected thread as a single document represented by a tree-like thread structure including at least one initial part of each of the messages [see Raghunandan, col. 7, line 59 to col.8, line 11] (incrementing the email count is to be classified at the appropriate levels of the hierarchy).
19. As to claim 31, Raghunandan, teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the display specification provides that each of the messages in at least one of the plurality of categories and subcategories are displayed separately in the top-level display of the

entire e-mail collection [see Raghunandan, col.8, lines 6-11](messages in each level of the hierarchy and display the counts to user).

20. As to claim 32, Raghunandan, teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the display specification provides that each of the messages in at least one of the plurality of categories and subcategories, and each of the messages categorized therein, is to be omitted from the top-level display of the entire e-mail collection [see Raghunandan, col.7, line 35 to col.8, line 55].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

22. Claims 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 21, 29 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulikunta Prahlad Raghunandan., (hereinafter Raghunandan) U.S. Patent No. 6,832,244 in view Mocleod Beck et al., (hereinafter Mocleod Beck) U.S. Patent No. 6,170,011.
23. As to claims 3, 10 and 18, Raghunandan teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the display specification provides that the e-mail messages in at least one of the plurality of categories and subcategories, and that the top-level display of the entire e-mail collection [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 56-58] (displays the email counts in the system hierarchy to the user on a display device). However, Raghunandan does not explicitly teach email encapsulated into threads.
24. In the same field of endeavor, Macleod Beck discloses (e.g.,...method and apparatus for determining and initiating interaction directionally... communication center). Macleod Beck discloses an email encapsulated into threads [See Macleod Beck col.22, lines 49-57, and col.27, line 63 to col.28, line16] (intermittent e-mail on the thread).
25. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated Macleod Beck's teachings of method and apparatus for determining and initiating interaction directionality within a multimedia communication center with the teachings of Raghunandan to have an email encapsulated into threads because it would have provided such a system would

maximize agent efficiency and increase potential enterprise profitability [see Macleod Beck, col.4, lines 47-50].

26. As to claims, 6, 13, and 21, Raghunandan teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: providing an editor window display which lists the plurality of categories and a plurality of message display for the top-level representation of the e-mail collection and each of the plurality of categories, and receiving and storing a user selection of one of the plurality of message display for at least one of the plurality of categories [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines 35-58](displays the email counts in the system hierarchy to the user on a display device). However, Raghunandan does not explicitly teach an edit window display.
27. In the same field of endeavor, Macleod Beck discloses (e.g.,...method and apparatus for determining and initiating interaction directionally... communication center). Macleod Beck discloses an edit window display [See Macleod Beck col.14, line 66 to col.15, line 5](window 133 is build to edited using COM codes available to the inventor and typically found in tool kits for the purpose of creating interactive displays on a web page).
28. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated Macleod Beck's teachings of method and apparatus for determining and initiating interaction directionality within a multimedia communication center with the teachings of Raghunandan to have an edit window display because it would have provided the motivation by stating that there

exist a need to improve service with regard to client satisfaction [see Macleod Beck col.3, lines 38-39].

29. As to claims 29, and 34, Raghunandan, teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: expanding an item representing an entire category or subcategory on the top-level representation of the e-mail collection by whose messages are categorized within the category or subcategory selected for expansion [see Raghunandan, col.7, lines35-67]. However, Raghunandan does not explicitly teach list of threads.
30. In the same field of endeavor, Macleod Beck discloses (e.g.,...method and apparatus for determining and initiating interaction directionally... communication center). Macleod Beck discloses a list of threads [See Macleod Beck col.22, lines 49-57, and col.27, line 63 to col.28, line16].
31. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated Macleod Beck's teachings of method and apparatus for determining and initiating interaction directionality within a multimedia communication center with the teachings of Raghunandan to have a list of threads because it would have provided such a system would maximize agent efficiency and increase potential enterprise profitability [see Macleod Beck, col.4, lines 47-50].

Response to Arguments

32. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's arguments include the failure

of previously applied art to expressly disclose display specification specifies, for each category and subcategory, the manner in which the messages categorized within that particular category or subcategory are to be displayed in a top-level representation of the entire e-mail collection (see Applicant's response, Dated July 7, 2006, Page 15, in the last paragraph). It is evident from the detailed mappings found in the above rejection(s) that Raghunandan and Macleod Beck disclosed this functionality (see above office action). Further, it is clear from the numerous teachings (previously and currently cited) that the provision for display specification specifies, for each category and subcategory, the manner in which the messages categorized within that particular category or subcategory are to be displayed in a top-level representation of the entire e-mail collection, was widely implemented in the networking art. Thus, Applicant's arguments drawn toward distinction of the claimed invention and the prior art teachings on this point are not considered persuasive.


Conclusion

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tammy T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3929. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **William Vaughn** can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TNN
September 22, 2006



WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100